

### REMARKS

Claims 31 and 33 have been amended. Claims 30 and 32 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 34 and 35 have been added. Claims 22-23, 25-29, 31 and 33-35 are currently pending. Entry of the amendments, and reexamination and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 25-27 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph because "there is insufficient structure in the claim (25) to distinguish the hood connected to the top wall from the lid as well as how they (the lid and the hood) cooperate to completely cover the opening." In response, Applicant does not know how to respond to this rejection, and respectfully seeks guidance from the Examiner. Specifically, claim 25 recites that the hood is connected to the top wall and cooperates with the lid to completely cover the opening. Would it be sufficient to delete the phrase "and cooperates with the lid to completely cover the opening" since the important part of the claim is that the hood is connected to the top wall? Claim 27 does not even recite the hood at all.

#### Claim 22

Claims 22, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 3,818,627 to Lebensfeld ("Lebensfeld") in view of USP 5,758,797 to Martindale ("Martindale"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 22 recites a lid pivotably coupled to the top wall. In contrast, Lebensfeld does not teach or suggest a lid pivotably coupled to a top wall. If the cap 16 in Lebensfeld is considered to be a "lid", then it is not pivotably connected to the top of the neck 22 of the bottle 12. In fact, the bottle 12 does not even have a top wall, since the top of the neck of the bottle 12 appears to be completely opened.

Thus, even a combination of Lebensfeld and Martindale will not yield all the limitations of claim 22. However, Applicant further submits that Martindale cannot be combined with Lebensfeld. Martindale is directed to a spill-resistant powder container, which is very different from fluids such as bubble solution. In other words, a person skilled in the art would have no incentive to consider the teachings in Martindale because the storage of powder entails different concerns and features as compared to the storage of bubble solution. In addition, Martindale does not teach or suggest a lid pivotably connected to the top wall of a bottle. As with Lebensfeld, Martindale's container does not appear to even have a top wall, and the lid 30 is not pivotably connected to the container 12.

Thus, claim 22, and claims 23 and 25-29 depending therefrom, are submitted to

be in condition for allowance.


Claim 30 and New Claims 34 and 35

Claim 30 has been canceled without prejudice. New independent claim 34 has been added, and recites two openings in the top wall, stoppers, two tubes extending from the two openings, and a stopper in each of these openings. In contrast, none of the prior art cited in this Office Action teach or suggest these limitations. Thus, claim 34, and claims 31 and 33 depending therefrom, are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

New independent claim 35 is very similar to claim 34, and is allowable for the same reasons.

In light of the above reasons, all pending claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any proposed amendments or informalities that can be resolved in a phone interview.

Respectfully Submitted,



Raymond Sun  
Attorney for Applicant  
12420 Woodhall Way  
Tustin, CA 92782  
Tel: 949-252-9180

Date: May 9, 2007

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Date: May 9, 2007

By:



Raymond Sun